

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
ENHANCEMENT PEER REVIEW GROUP

Thursday, June 11, 2008 – 9:00 a.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|--|---|
| Cato Esquivel, Chair, Goodyear,
representing the Transportation Review
Committee | # Peggy Rubach, MCDOT, representing
the MAG Pedestrian Working Group |
| Charles Andrews, Avondale, representing
the MAG Street Committee | Reed Kempton, Scottsdale, representing
the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force |
| * Angela Dye, A Dye Design, representing
the American Society of Landscape
Architects, Arizona Chapter | Doug Kupel, Arizona Preservation
Foundation, representing the
Archaeological and Historic Preservation
Community |
| Eric Faulhaber, Vision Gallery, representing
the Arts Community | |
- * Not present.
Participated by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Janeen K. Gaskins, City of Avondale | Evelyn Ng, City of Scottsdale |
| Dave Showen, Town of Buckeye | Kerry Wilcoxon, City of Phoenix |
| Clemenc Ligocki, Maricopa County | Steve Hancock, City of Glendale |
| Sorin Puscan, Town of Buckeye | Eric Iwersen, City of Tempe |
| Lance Calvert, City of El Mirage | Briiana Leone, City of Phoenix |
| Romina Korkes, City of Goodyear | Maureen DeCindis, MAG |
| Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix | Steve Gross, MAG |
| Cheryl Brunton, City of Phoenix | Kevin Wallace, MAG |

1. Call to Order

Chair Cato Esquivel called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Chair Esquivel asked members of the Working Group, and those individuals who were in attendance to introduce themselves. He also noted that Ms. Peggy Rubach was attending the meeting via telephone conference call.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Esquivel stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience, and moved to the next item on the Agenda.

4. Enhancement Peer Review Group Composition and Operating Procedures

Chair Esquivel introduced Mr. Kevin Wallace, MAG Transit Program Manager, to provide an overview of the Enhancement Peer Review Group's composition and operating procedures. Mr. Wallace addressed the Committee and stated that it was important to discuss the Committee's composition and operating procedures, as there were a number of new Committee members, and also because several changes had been made since last year. He explained that MAG, at the request of several member agencies, had been working over the past few months to make the transportation enhancement process more inclusive and transparent.

Mr. Wallace then explained that the purpose of this group is to make recommendations to the ADOT Transportation Enhancement Fund Review Committee for the expenditure of federal transportation enhancement funds. The Committee will be chaired by a member of the Transportation Review Committee, and includes one member each from the Street Committee, Bicycle Task Force and Pedestrian Working Group. The Committee also includes one an historic preservation representative, a landscape architecture representative, and one arts representative. Mr. Wallace then noted that members of the Committee are expected to represent their specific area of expertise, and not their particular agency.

Mr. Wallace summarized the changes that have been made to the committee from the previous year. He noted that the changes were reviewed and discussed by the MAG Intergovernmental Representatives and the Transportation Review Committee before being considered by the Management Committee and ultimately approved by the MAG Regional Council. Mr. Wallace then explained that the previous Enhancement Funds Working Group had been reconstituted as the Enhancement Peer Review Group. He said that members may not rank their own projects, that members may serve up to two years, that the committee is to be geographically balanced, and that the voting on the committee will be transparent. Mr. Wallace noted that the provision for transparent voting was added by the Transportation Review Committee.

Mr. Doug Kupel asked if there were problems with the way the Committee was organized in the past. Mr. Wallace stated that several member jurisdictions had expressed concern about the process and that they wanted to see a more transparent and inclusive process in the future.

Mr. Wallace stated that the Committee would review and rank projects at two separate meetings, and that today's meeting would involve a review of the applications. He noted that the process for reviewing and ranking applications was summarized in Agenda Attachment A. Mr. Wallace explained that the process for today's meeting would include a brief introduction of the projects by MAG staff, a five minute presentation by the applicants, and a 10 minute question and answer period led by the Committee Chair. Mr. Wallace noted that MAG staff would submit issues

raised at today's meeting to the applicants, and they will provide written responses prior to the next Committee meeting. Mr. Wallace then stated that the Committee would utilize the evaluation criteria used by the state Transportation Enhancement Review Committee for evaluating the projects, which was included in the Committee packet with the applications. Mr. Wallace summarized the six project criteria used on the Transportation Enhancement Review Committee evaluation form, including overall project considerations and objectives, project need, project maintenance, cost effectiveness, community involvement, and community benefit or improvement. Mr. Wallace noted that the ranking form included a detailed summary of these criteria, and that MAG would not collect the ranking forms from the Committee members. He then explained that the Committee members would complete ballots provided by MAG, and that the individual rankings would be distributed at the meeting. Mr. Wallace concluded his report by noting that Committee members are prohibited from ranking their own projects, and that the Committee would take a brief recess while MAG staff compiled and calculated the initial rankings.

Mr. Kupel asked if he would be prohibited from voting on the City of Phoenix project. Mr. Wallace asked Mr. Kupel if he was an employee of the City of Phoenix. Mr. Kupel responded that he is a City of Phoenix employee. Mr. Wallace stated that as a City of Phoenix employee, Mr. Kupel would not be allowed to rank Phoenix projects.

Mr. Kupel stated that MAG should reword the slide that says that Committee members are prohibited from ranking their own projects. He explained that unlike other agency representatives, he didn't work in the transportation department, and wasn't a direct project sponsor. Mr. Kupel suggested that the slide should indicate that the Committee members would not rank a project from the agencies they worked for.

Ms. Peggy Rubach asked if the prohibition from ranking their own projects would penalize an agency that had a member on the Committee. Mr. Wallace responded that it would not, because the calculation is a rank average, based on the number of Committee members ranking the individual project.

5. Staff Report

Chair Esquivel moved to the next agenda item and asked Mr. Wallace to provide an update on current items of interest. Mr. Wallace stated that he had one item for the Committee, a summary of the previous year's projects that received transportation enhancement funding. He indicated that the MAG region received funding for three of the 24 projects funded statewide, and that a fourth project from the MAG region just missed being funded. Mr. Wallace concluded his report by stating that the three funded projects were Glendale's Maryland Avenue Bicycle Route Spot Improvements, Maricopa County's Regional Safe Routes to School Support Center, and Valley Metro/RPTA's Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Education Program.

6. Review and Discussion of Round 16 Enhancement Fund Applications

Chair Esquivel moved to the next order of business and indicated that the applicants would have an opportunity to present their projects and receive feedback from the Committee. He explained that the applicants would be able to sit at the table, and provided time for Mr. Steve Gross, MAG staff, to explain how to use the cordless mouse for Power Point presentations. Mr. Esquivel then asked if there were any questions, and then proceeded to the application review process for the projects identified below, which were heard by the Working Group in order.

Tempe – Alameda Drive at I-10 Bike/Ped Bridge Enhancements

A representative from Tempe was not present, so Chair Esquivel indicated that he would move to the City of Phoenix presentation. Mr. Kupel indicated that he would like to provide comments on the Tempe project. Mr. Wallace stated that if a representative from Tempe didn't arrive at the conclusion of the presentations, then the Committee could discuss the project and MAG staff would provide their comments to the applicant.

Phoenix – Royal Palm Bicycle & Pedestrian Bridge

Mr. Kerry Wilcoxon addressed the Committee, and informed them that the proposed project would improve the bicycle and pedestrian network through the provision of a bridge over the Arizona Canal, between 15th Avenue and an existing bike path on the north side of the Arizona Canal. Mr. Wilcoxon indicated that striped bicycle lanes would be provided along 15th Avenue later this summer, between Dunlap and Thomas. He then stated that the canal is a wonderful community asset, and the bridge would provide a much needed north-south link in this part of the city. Mr. Wilcoxon explained that the project would provide a 10 foot pathway up to the bridge, which would span approximately 80 feet across the Arizona Canal. Mr. Wilcoxon said the city was fortunate because the bridge was located on an undeveloped portion of SRP land, and that SRP was supportive of the project.

Ms. Rubach stated that the applicant may want to request a letter of support from SRP to strengthen the answer to question 14-C. She noted that the cost of ADOT review fees would be \$3,000, since the applicant would be self administering the project. Ms. Rubach then indicated that the application was not signed by the sponsor representative. Ms. Briiana Leon, City of Phoenix, noted that the original application submitted to MAG included the required signatures.

Mr. Reed Kempton stated that this was a good project. He noted that the applicant may want to change the tone the response to question 13 that states the project would provide a canal crossing "without being in direct harms way of vehicular traffic," as many cyclists don't feel that riding on the street is a problem. Mr. Kempton then asked if the response to question 14-E was correct, because he wasn't aware that a canal was considered waters of the U.S. because it is not navigable. Mr. Wilcoxon responded that the waters of U.S. designation came from information provided by SRP. Mr. Kempton concluded his comments by noting on question 18 that the correct abbreviation for the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists was CAzB.

Mr. Charles Andrews asked for additional information on the environmental component of the project. Mr. Wilcoxon stated that the project would entail reviews by the city's historic preservation and environmental departments, and would address all federal environmental requirements. Mr. Andrews noted that providing bicycle lanes on 15th Avenue would present a challenge, considering the condition of the pavement. Mr. Wilcoxon stated that in addition to the pavement condition, the project would be challenging because they would be removing a travel lane to accommodate the bicycle lanes, and also because there is a 1,200 foot section north of Butler that is too narrow to accommodate bicycle lanes. Mr. Wilcoxon then noted that the City of Phoenix had completed a helmet usage study and that this area receives significant usage by bicyclists. Mr. Andrews concluded his remarks by noting that this was a nice project.

Mr. Kupel said that he would like to reiterate the comments by Ms. Rubach about how a letter of support from SRP would help the application. He then stated it was his understanding that canals are not considered Waters of the U.S., and that the applicant should verify this issue. Mr. Kupel concluded his remarks by noting a typo on the answer to question 19, Fifteen Avenue instead of Fifteenth Avenue, and suggested that a thorough review would be appropriate to clean up the application. There were no further questions or comments.

Buckeye – Pedestrian and Bicycle Enhancements of the 65-Acre Park

Mr. Dave Showen addressed the Committee, and informed them that the Buckeye project was intended to enhance the non-motorized trails in 65-Acre Park, which is central to several canal trails. He stated that the project will also enhance safe routes to Inca School to the west, and will include trails, two bike rest areas, landscaping, and lighting bollards every 100 feet. Mr. Showen stated that the project will also help address the urban heat island effect and storm drain issues by utilizing decomposed granite instead of an asphalt surface. Mr. Showen concluded his presentation by noting that the project will provide for approximately 9,000 feet of decomposed granite trails and will cross two 404 permit washes.

Mr. Kempton stated that this application may not be fundable at the state level. He explained that recreational loop trails are not eligible for transportation enhancement funds, and that using decomposed granite may hurt the application. Mr. Kempton suggested strengthening the part of the application that connects travel options with the school. He then noted that AASHTO provides guidelines, not standards. Mr. Kempton concluded his remarks by noting that it would be important to apply the appropriate design guidelines to the particular hardscape elements being considered.

Mr. Kupel stated that he saw this project as a park enhancement, not a transportation enhancement. He indicated that the application should be modified to make it a transportation enhancement project.

Ms. Rubach stated that the project was geared to a recreational trail program, and should be modified to focus on the alternative transportation aspects of the improvements. She suggested that the applicant highlight the proximity of the school and its number of students, as well as the

number of seniors in the area, and what activities they could access with the proposed improvements.

Mr. Andrews stated that approximately half of the costs were identified for design, and that the applicant should review the cost estimates. Mr. Showen indicated that the majority of the design costs are for the overall park project, and could be removed from this application. Mr. Showen then stated that he would modify the application to highlight the non-motorized trails in the project and their connection with the school and adjacent subdivisions. There were no further questions or comments.

Maricopa County – Old US-80 Gila River Bridge

Mr. Clemenc Ligocki addressed the Committee, and informed them that the Old US 80 Gila River Bridge is located in a rural agricultural area of southwestern Maricopa County, between Arlington to the north and Gila Bend to the South. Mr. Ligocki noted that the future traffic forecast for this section of roadway is 8,500 vehicles per day, which the current structure won't be able to handle. He also noted that the two lane bridge does not accommodate modern farm equipment, and numerous collisions have damaged the structure. Mr. Logocki explained that due to collision damage, age, and overall repair needs, the sufficiency rating for the bridge has recently dropped to 44.9. Mr. Ligocki stated that the bridge is important because of its historic significance, and as connection for farm activities, schools, and as a detour route for SR 85. He then indicated that the project would be conducted in three phases. Phase One would complete necessary repairs to the bridge structure. Phase Two would involve painting the bridge, and Phase Three would ultimately build a new bridge and convert the existing bridge to a bicycle/pedestrian/local use facility. Mr. Ligocki concluded his remarks by noting that MCDOT would be responsible for maintaining the bridge, that the project has completed a value engineering study to ensure the best use of funds, and that there has been a lot of community involvement in developing the project.

Mr. Kempton stated that this was a good project. He noted that on question 13, the year 1927 should be substituted for the term "1920's" and that the AASHTO provides guidelines, not standards. Mr. Kempton then asked if there was a federal bridge ranking that would say where the project rates in terms of needed improvements from a federal perspective. Mr. Ligocki stated that the sufficiency rating showed the priority for improvements, but there may also be another ranking list.

Mr. Kupel stated that this was an excellent project and that it was long overdue. He then inquired about the handouts that were provided, and what the difference was between them and the application. Mr. Ligocki noted that the application was technically over the 20 page limit, because of a map that was added, and the handouts showed how MCDOT would meet the 20 page limit. Ms. Rubach affirmed that this was correct. Mr. Ligocki also stated that while Maricopa County received a project in the previous round, the application was actually submitted by MCDOT on behalf of several other agencies, and that the project was currently being administered by Valley Metro/RPTA. Mr. Ligocki then distributed copies of the County's Round 15 application. There were no further questions or comments.

Scottsdale – Arizona Canal Shared-Use Path Project: 64th Street to Goldwater Boulevard

Ms. Evelyn Ng addressed the Committee, and informed them that the Arizona Canal Shared-Use Path project would provide a critical linkage with several other trails between Phoenix, Scottsdale, and Tempe. Ms. Ng noted that the project would construct 0.9 miles of a 14 foot wide shared-use path along the south bank of the Arizona Canal, between 64th Street and Goldwater Boulevard. She then described the access points along the route and explained that the total project cost was estimated at \$1,684,615. Ms. Ng stated that the project would connect two transportation enhancement funded projects.

Mr. Eric Faulhaber asked for more information about the public art component of the project, and whether it would be coordinated with the Scottsdale Arts Council. Ms. Ng provided an overview of the anticipated art elements, and indicated that the work would be coordinated with the Scottsdale Arts Council.

Ms. Rubach noted that the ADOT review fees could be reduced to \$3,000, since the applicant would be self administering the project. Ms. Rubach said that it would be helpful to quantify the number of miles of pathways that would be connected with the completion of this project. Ms. Rubach then stated that the attached resolution did not address all of the points required in the ADOT application. Ms. Rubach noted that at last year's TERC meeting, ADOT staff had expressed concerns with a prior project in Scottsdale, and that it would be important to discuss the status of that project in this application.

Mr. Andrews stated that this was a nice project. He asked that the applicant spend some more time on the project costs, particularly the estimates for concrete. Mr. Andrews then asked about the project inflation rate, and what unit was referred to on this line item in the cost estimate. Mr. Wallace suggested that the unit was likely indicating the number of years the project costs were being inflated, and Ms. Ng indicated that this was correct.

Ms. Rubach stated that at last year's TERC meeting, several members spent a considerable amount of time in reviewing construction unit costs. She noted in particular that there was discussion about the unit costs for trees, lighting, and decomposed granite. In reviewing this year's applications, Ms. Rubach noted that there was a wide range of costs for construction items, and suggested that this issue be addressed before submitting the projects to ADOT. Mr. Kupel stated that he had noticed the same issue for boulders. There were no further questions or comments.

Avondale – 107th Avenue Underpass Enhancements

Ms. Janeen Gaskins addressed the Committee, and informed them that this was the second time the City of Avondale had submitted this state project for enhancement funding. She explained that the current underpass included a four foot sidewalk, which would be replaced with a six to eight foot sidewalk in the future. Ms. Gaskins stated that the project match would be provided by ADOT, with an additional funding to be provided by the City of Avondale. Ms. Gaskins stated that the project would provide 430 linear feet of improvements within the ADOT right-of-

way. She said that the project would include lighting, utility replacements, landscaping, and retaining walls with artistic renderings. Ms. Gaskins noted that a concern on this project last year was that ADOT should have made the requested improvements as part of the I-10 widening project. She then explained that from ADOT's perspective, the basic mobility needs of pedestrians at this location is met with the four foot sidewalk, and that the requested improvements were truly enhancements. Ms. Gaskins stated that the project is supported by the ADOT I-10 expansion project and would provide connectivity for more than 5,000 people. Ms. Gaskins concluded her presentation by addressing project maintenance, cost effectiveness, community involvement, and community benefit.

Mr. Kupel stated that the applicant should review the response to question 18. Specifically, Mr. Kupel noted that meeting ADA standards was a necessity, and did not seem to be a typical argument for an enhancement project. Mr. Kupel also noted the spelling of roller bladers was incorrect. Mr. Kempton stated that the term roller bladers was proprietary and the appropriate term to use was in-line skaters.

Ms. Rubach stated that the application should indicate where the new sidewalks would be six feet, and where they would be eight. She suggested that if that information was not known, the application could indicate that the sidewalks would be widened to eight feet where possible, and to six feet in other areas. Ms. Rubach also stated that the application would be strengthened with letters of support from employers in the area who would benefit from the project in providing a non-motorized mobility for their employees. There were no further questions or comments.

Avondale – Avondale Agua Fria Undercrossing

Ms. Janeen Gaskins addressed the Committee, and informed them that the Agua Fria Undercrossing project would provide connectivity to work, shopping and recreation to residents. She explained that the project would provide approximately 400 feet of a 12 to 15 foot wide pathway along the Agua Fria River. Ms. Gaskins noted that the project would connect Friendship Park and the Avondale Environmental Park, and would also provide a link to various commercial and industrial sites. Ms. Gaskins stated that the project would include safety hand railing, LED lighting, trash receptacles, artwork, an information kiosk, and a rest node. Ms. Gaskins concluded her presentation by addressing project maintenance, cost effectiveness, community involvement, and community benefit.

Mr. Kempton stated that he would remove the bench simulation in the cover photograph, as it would present a possible hazard for bicyclists. He noted that there was a word missing in the last three lines of the response to question 13. He then suggested that the applicant provide additional information about the design assistance grant mentioned in the response to question 18.

Mr. Kupel noted that there were several typos in the response to question 18, regarding Palm Meadows Home Owners Association, medical offices, and others. He also noted that Friendship Park was misspelled on the project map.

Ms. Rubach identified another typo in the response to question 14-D, where the word “and” should be replaced with the word “an”. Ms. Rubach suggested that the project map be expanded to include the Avondale Environmental Park. Ms. Rubach noted that the ADOT review fees could be reduced to \$3,000, since the applicant would be self administering the project. Ms. Rubach then stated that the attached resolution did not address all of the points required in the ADOT application. There were no further questions or comments.

Glendale – New River Multi-Use Pathway Lighting Project

Mr. Steve Hancock addressed the Committee, and informed them that the Glendale project was strictly for lighting along the New River Multi-Use Pathway. Mr. Hancock stated that the project would increase bicycle and pedestrian safety along the extensive pathway by providing 100 lights between Northern Avenue and the planned Grand Canal Pathway. He explained that lighting will be important for the New River Pathway because of all the growth and development in the area, including the University of Phoenix Stadium, Jobing Arena, and the future Cactus League spring training facility. Mr. Hancock noted that many of these venues will provide for evening activities. Mr. Hancock then stated that the lighting component was dropped from the New River Pathway project because of its cost, and that the City of Glendale had committed \$235,000 in local matching funds to complete the project.

Mr. Kempton noted that the response to question 14-D should reference the Flood Control District, or FDC. Mr. Kempton also noted that on question 19, the response should reference the University of Phoenix Stadium, rather than the Phoenix University Stadium.

Ms. Rubach stated that the project map should include a larger area, particularly in Peoria, and that the application should indicate the number of pathway miles in Peoria that would link with this project. Ms. Rubach then suggested that the applicant expand the discussion for the Cactus League and other venues to include opportunities for workers to use the facility to commute to work, instead of only focusing on the event patrons. Ms. Rubach also suggested to include information about additional lighting along the New River Pathway to the north and to the south in Phoenix. Ms. Rubach noted that the ADOT review fees could be reduced to \$3,000, since the applicant would be self administering the project. There were no further questions or comments.

El Mirage – Multi-Use Trail Project: Dysart Road to Cactus Road

Mr. Lance Calvert addressed the Committee, and stated that the City of El Mirage had grown from 7,000 in 2000 to 30,000 at the time of the MAG mid-census, to approximately 40,000 today. Mr. Calvert then explained that the intention of this project was to utilize an existing drainage way to provide for bicycle and pedestrian travel in a rapidly growing part of the community. He stated that the project would establish the first section of the El Mirage Trail Master Plan, and would connect existing sidewalks and an on-street bicycle path along Dysart Road. He stated that the project would provide a safe off street alternative mode of transportation to local businesses, community parks, and residences. Mr. Calvert noted that approximately 25% of the city’s population lives in close proximity to the proposed project.

Mr. Kempton stated that his primary concerns were related to the project budget. In particular, Mr. Kempton noted there weren't any funds allocated for mobilization and administration or the required environmental determination. Mr. Kempton also stated that the concrete costs seemed low. There were no further questions or comments.

Surprise – Grand Avenue Multi-Use Trail: Dysart Road to Sunrise Boulevard

A representative from Surprise not present, so Chair Esquivel asked for comments on the application. Mr. Kupel noted that the resolution was not specific to this project and was one year old. Mr. Kempton stated that the quality of the pictures in the application was not very good. Mr. Wallace indicated that he would contact the applicant about being available at the next meeting if the committee had additional questions.

Tempe – Alameda Drive at I-10 Bike/Ped Bridge Enhancements

Mr. Eric Iwersen addressed the Committee and informed them that the proposed project would construct non-motorized ramps and a bridge over I-10 at Alameda Drive in Tempe. He noted that Alameda Drive dead-ends at both ends of the project, and the bridge would provide an important connection across the I-10 corridor, which is the busiest freeway in the state. Mr. Iwersen informed the Committee that four years ago, the City of Tempe and ADOT had concluded in a feasibility study that the project was feasible. Mr. Iwersen stated that there are numerous activity centers adjacent to the corridor, including Diablo Stadium. He also noted that the City of Phoenix supports the project, which would improve non-motorized access across I-10 and between the two cities. Mr. Iwersen stated that the project is included in the city's General Plan and the MAG Regional Off Street System Plan. Mr. Iwersen concluded his presentation by discussing the two design concepts for the project.

Mr. Kupel stated that it would be nice to see a regional map, to see how the project closes the gap in the regional system, including Roeser Road in Phoenix. Mr. Kupel noted that the word "precedent" should replace the word "precedence" in the response to question 19. Mr. Kupel then stated that including the two design concepts in the application might be a problem, as the applicant had not decided on which one to pursue.

Mr. Kempton stated that the applicant should include the mileage of bikeways being connected between 7th Avenue and Roeser Road in Phoenix and Tempe. Mr. Kempton also suggested that the applicant use the original photos in the application, rather than copies.

Ms. Rubach noted that the ADOT review fees could be reduced to \$3,000, since the applicant would be self administering the project. Ms. Rubach asked if the timing of the ADOT I-10 widening project discussed in question 14-B was consistent with the enhancement project timing discussed in question 14-C. Mr. Iwersen stated that they have been coordinating the application with ADOT, and there appears to be schedule flexibility on both sides. Ms. Rubach then questioned the response to question 14-D. Specifically, Ms. Rubach was concerned that stating that approximately 75% of the right-of-way was owned by ADOT might raise issues at the TERC, because 75% is the minimum ADOT right-of-way necessary to qualify for a state

application. She indicated that it seemed like less of the project would be in ADOT right-of-way, given the number of feet required for the bridge ramps on city right-of-way in relation to the bridge itself. There were no further questions or comments.

Chair Esquivel asked if there were any other comments on the project applications at this time. Ms. Rubach then stated that she had been momentarily disconnected during the discussion of the El Mirage project, and would like to offer two comments. First, she indicated that the maps provided in the Power Point were better than the ones in the application. Second, she suggested that the applicant should look for support letters from area employers.

Mr. Wallace stated that he had heard a number of comments from the committee members about construction cost estimates, and that he would include a recommendation to all of the applicants to review their construction cost estimates.

7. Other Items Relevant to Round 16 and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

Chair Esquivel moved on to the next item of business and stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience. He then asked for discussion from the Committee on moving the date of the ranking meeting from June 19th to June 24th. Ms. Rubach stated that the June 24th date would work better for her. Mr. Wallace noted that Ms. Angela Dye who was not in attendance at today's meeting, would also be unable to attend the meeting on June 19th. Chair Esquivel asked if there were any concerns with moving the date of the next meeting to June 24th at 9:00 a.m. Hearing none, Chair Esquivel asked for a motion. Ms. Rubach moved that the next meeting of the Enhancement Peer Review Group be moved from June 19th to June 24th at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Kempton seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

Chair Esquivel then asked if there were any other items that members of the Committee wished to discuss. Hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

8. Future Meeting Dates

Chair Esquivel stated that following the previous action by the Committee under Agenda Item Number Seven, the next meeting of the Enhancement Peer Review Group would be held on Tuesday, June 24, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. There being no further comments or questions, Chair Esquivel adjourned the meeting at 11:25 a.m.